

**HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT  
FEDERAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Final Meeting Summary: Session #2  
Thursday, October 11, 2001  
Wahluke School District, Mattawa, WA**

The Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee met Thursday, October 11, 2001 from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm in Studio 73 of the Wahluke School District, Mattawa, WA.

The purpose of the meeting was two-fold: 1) to present information to the Committee regarding U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Comprehensive Conservation Planning processes and National Wildlife Refuge System policies, and 2) to take action on Committee business by finalizing groundrules and electing a Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee.

**Welcome and Introductions**

Greg Hughes, Designated Federal Officer and Project Leader, Hanford Reach National Monument, opened the meeting and welcomed Committee members and alternates, the public, Wahluke School District staff who had helped plan the meeting, and officials and staff from both U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Department of Energy.

Dr. William Miller, Superintendent of the Wahluke School District welcomed the Committee to the community and stated that they were honored to host the meeting.

Alice Shorett, facilitator, gave a brief overview of the day's agenda (Attachment B). She introduced the two guest presenters from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS): Mike Marxen, Pacific Northwest Planning Team Leader, and Steve Moore, Chief, Division of Refuges Operations Support. She indicated that Mr. Marxen would be presenting information to the Committee regarding the FWS's Comprehensive Conservation Planning (CCP) process and Mr. Moore would be presenting National Wildlife Refuge System policies and related legislation that would be critical as CCP development begins.

Ms. Shorett asked that everyone present in the meeting introduce him/herself. (A complete list of attendees can be found at the end of the summary.)

**Meeting Summary from Session #1**

Ms. Shorett requested comments or changes on the meeting summary from the Committee's first meeting, June 20 and June 21, 2001. There were no changes and the meeting summary was approved as presented. Ms. Shorett clarified that at each meeting, the Committee will amend and approve the draft meeting summary from the previous meeting and then they will be made final and available to the public.

<b>ACTION:</b> Committee adoption of Session #1 Meeting Summary.
--

**Committee Chair and Vice Chair Nomination and Selection Process**

Ms. Shorett indicated that nominations could still be added. The selection procedure previously distributed to the Committee was presented. The process was clarified stating that 80% of Committee members (seats) must be present to have a vote, as stated in the Committee Charter. The Chair and Vice Chair would be elected by majority vote. If a simple majority does not exist, a run-off with the top two would take place. Any candidates for Chair that do not receive the vote will become Vice Chair nominees, in addition to those already nominated for Vice Chair.

Ms. Shorett indicated that names of the nominees would be presented following the FWS presentations. Prior to voting, each Chair and then Vice Chair nominee would have a few moments to discuss his/her approach to the role. The process was approved by the Committee.

### **FWS Comprehensive Conservation Plan Presentation**

Mike Marxen presented the eight-step U.S. Fish and Wildlife Comprehensive Conservation Plan process. Mr. Marxen indicated his delight in working with the Committee on this planning effort, but clarified that the CCP planning process is a structured, formalized process (as laid out in the Federal Register), that is used nationally throughout the National Wildlife Refuge System, and integrated with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes, as well. Mr. Marxen's complete presentation is included as Attachment C.

Following Mr. Marxen's presentation was a question and response session.

### Questions and Responses

Will 2-3 years pass before any actions are implemented?

FWS is putting together a comprehensive plan to address all actions synergistically, not piece by piece, as they arrive.

What is the connection between the core planning team and the Committee? The core planning team are those FWS people who will be doing the research, drafting planning documents, and working to package the information. They will provide information to the Committee, and likewise the Committee can ask them to research an alternative. The two are not on separate tracks. The Committee advises all along.

When does the core planning team come in? Are they consultants? Can we review who they are?

They are mostly FWS employees, not consultants. Some will be existing employees and others will be hired. Very specific funds are dedicated to Monument staffing needs. Reviewing the applicants does not fall under the Committee's role in FACA. The Committee could give advice on qualities, but the FWS has qualifications for positions already defined and has to be sure that short (planning purposes) and long-term (management of the Monument) staffing needs are fulfilled.

Do we, as the Committee, react to core planning team's developments or do they come to us for upfront advice?

Currently, that process could be better defined. The Committee meetings fit in with the overall planning process at key points—not as a reaction to other work, but as leadership.

The most important element of what we are collectively engaging in is the process, not the plan. Everyone—this Committee, agencies, core planning team and the community—need to be integrated into the process.

When we finish, will the CCP be managing a refuge or a national monument?

It will not be managed as it is now; however, there are management requirements through the NWRS Act. If there is a management conflict between monument or refuge status, the Presidential Proclamation establishing the Monument prevails.

Nothing keeps the Committee from putting its stamp on the Plan except sideboards (FWS and DOE policies and legislation, etc.)?

Right.

Will the Committee be able to devise its own solutions rather than having to respond only to options created by the core planning team?

The Committee may come up with completely different solutions, as long as they are within the sideboards. Keith Klein (DOE) and Anne Badgley (FWS) will respond to the Committee with which option they have chosen.

DOE has a specific science mission. How does that fit in with the FWS's National Wildlife Refuge System policy and CCP?

It would need to be determined if the actions were compatible with NWRS objectives or if they would be considered a valid existing right. This has been discussed already with DOE to understand the impacts /effects of radiation on those lands. FWS supports a continued effort. Ideally, we will maximize the two agencies' effort.

What are the step-down plans and when do those issues become addressed?

The CCP is strategic, whereas the step-down plans are tactical. In some cases these more detailed, operational plans, stand on their own and are evaluated to ensure consistency with objectives and the overall plan. Some step-down plans may be written as part of the original plan, as appendices. Some are interim and will get public review. An example of an interim step-down plan that is currently active would be fire management. In some cases, to do what is currently needed is the responsibility of the land manager, both to the resource and for neighbors.

What is the timeframe between the draft and the final CCPs' releases? In that transition, what is the Committee's role?

The Committee will be engaged in response to public comment, assessing the comments and recommending changes in the plan to respond.

The Committee will be struggling to understand its role. Will it be technical or "nuts and bolts" of the CCP? Is the core planning team a technical advisory committee to the Committee?

The Committee's role, as stated in its Charter is to "make recommendations to the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Energy on the preparation of a long-term management plan for the Hanford Reach National Monument Comprehensive Conservation Plan and associated Environmental Impact Statement (CCP/EIS), focusing on advice that identifies and reconciles, where possible, land management issues while meeting the Proclamation directives to protect the biologic, scientific, archaeological, historic, geologic, and paleontologic objects of interest in the Monument." The core planning team is drafting the plan, with Committee advice along the way.

Who has decision-making authority over river operations?

The Columbia River operations are complex.

When will the Committee have meetings and how will we be kept informed of what's proceeding with FWS?

The Committee will meet as often as necessary. FWS can keep the Committee constantly informed. FWS will be writing the initial drafts of the CCP for feedback from the Committee and their constituencies.

Do FACA rules prohibit conference calls for discussing issues?

FACA allows for conference calls for Committee and subcommittee meetings and discussion.

Does the draft management plan that was done on the FEALE (Fitzner-Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve) help or impede the Committee's work?

Many things have changed since the draft alternatives were written. There has been a **major** fire and the landscape has significantly changed. The area was declared a National Monument after the draft was completed. Several elements in the alternatives contain useful information that we don't want to lose. Pieces of the draft could be provided to make the information available to the Committee. Also, there are government-to-government relations that will be honored before such alternatives can go public. There are also other plans, such as the Counties' Interim Action Plan that are available and contain great information. The Hanford Reach EIS talks about some ongoing activities on the River and is another good source of information. The data-sifting element of the planning process is a huge job.

The FWS priorities [the big 6] state that environmental education is important. Research is not specifically highlighted, but it's an integral element to environmental education.

We want to management decisions to be science-based in order to help us manage the resource better. We are looking at all kinds of research projects, but it comes down to the funding. FWS has not highlighted research as a priority, but has considered it separately and will continue with it. The Monument has an overlay status (overlying DOE) and there is a need to more clearly define jurisdictions.

Issue of jurisdiction are still fluid. When can we as a planning advisory unit expect resolution on those? Some have been worked out in the agency MOU between the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Department of Energy distributed at the last meeting. They have been worked out for FEALE, Wahluke and Saddle Mountain between DOE and FWS.

Issues of land transition?

Some of those issues have been worked out and others are in progress. Resolution could occur during the planning process. Other lands may be transferred in the planning lifetime. DOE still needs some areas and there is an access agreement for DOE research.

The planning process needs to consider what outside influences are affecting the Monument.

### **National Wildlife Refuge System Policies Presentation**

Steve Moore presented the policies and legislation that drive the National Wildlife Refuge System (Attachment D), highlighting the Improvement Act of 1997, CCP Planning for Refuges, Compatibility

and Biological Integrity. Mr. Moore invited the Committee to get in touch with him and the FWS to get more specific questions answered regarding his presentation, legislation and FWS policies.

### **Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair Presented**

The nominees for Chair and Vice Chair were presented to the Committee.

Chair:

Doug Ancona  
Chris Jensen  
Jim Watts

Vice Chair:

Jeff Tayer  
Kris Watkins

Ms. Watkins thanked the Committee but graciously declined the nomination for Vice Chair for the current elections.

### **Committee Groundrules**

The Committee discussed proposed revisions to their groundrules, amended the groundrules, and accepted them as revised subject to later revision (see Attachment A).

<b>ACTION:</b> Adoption of Committee Groundrules.
---

During their discussion Committee Member Robert Tomanawash joined the meeting.

### **Selection of Committee Chair and Vice Chair**

Each of the candidates for Committee Chair gave a brief overview of his interest in the role of Chair and how he would approach it.

Ballots were distributed, filled out and passed back in, one for each Committee seat. Mr. Jim Watts was chosen as Chair of the Committee by simple majority.

Doug Ancona and Chris Jensen's names were passed to the slate for Vice Chair, to accompany Jeff Tayer. Closed-ballot voting again took place. There was not a simple majority on the first vote, so a run-off was

<b>ACTION:</b> Jim Watts selected as Committee Chair and Jeff Tayer selected as Committee Vice Chair.
---

held between Jeff Tayer and Chris Jensen, the top two vote recipients. After the run-off, Mr. Tayer was determined by simple majority by the Committee to be their Vice Chair.

Jim Watts assumed the role of Chair immediately and called a break for the Committee.

**Background Information Requests: Base Map**

Paula Call, Outdoor Recreation Planner, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, distributed a base map showing several different features of the Monument. The map would be used in conjunction with Mylar overlays showing specific features. Ms. Call asked the Committee to identify those areas that they would like to see illustrated in the overlays.

The Committee identified the following areas:

- Adjacencies (areas adjacent to the Monument boundaries)
- Fire histories (years and locations)
- Infrastructure (railroads, etc.)
- Electrical transmission lines
- DOE proposed riverbank restoration
- Historical buildings, areas and public launches
- All the Hanford areas and central plateau
- Major groundwater plumes
- Noxious weed and plant areas
- 26 “tourist attractions”
- Publicly recognized cultural resource sites.

It was asked if the map constitutes an official legal description of the monument. Ms. Call responded saying that it is not the legal description, but it is as close as possible, for use by the Committee and the planning team.

**Public Comment**

Ms. Shorett opened the floor to public comment.

Dr. William Miller

I would like to share a few comments that you may not have already heard about our area. Our School District encompasses sixty-six thousand acres of the Hanford Reach National Monument as designated by Executive Order by President Clinton.

We all want to preserve this land. We are all conservationists. We all want to protect the Columbia River corridor.

Most of us want our government to keep its past promises to the people.

A well-organized minority of people should not be able to impose their will over others.

The Tri-County Citizens Committee worked for two years to put together a plan that: a) protected the river better than a Wild and Scenic Designation would have, and b) brought County, State and Federal agencies together. (This is a failure that we all are painfully aware of today.) The Committee worked with the Audubon Society to come up with agreeable wording for the Committee’s final document. At the last minute the Audubon pulled their support. When Vice President Al Gore announced the designation of the Hanford Reach National Monument, it was a surprise to me that the Audubon Society was honored by sharing the stage with the Vice President. I commented to myself, “*Et tu Brute*”.

We are at war again to protect our freedoms, just as we were aware when many a good citizen sacrificed their land and futures for the Hanford reservation.

I don't recall that anyone promised to turn their land over to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—a government bureaucracy that seems to be immune to citizens, and to whom a blade of grass seems to hold more value. (I do see a U.S. Fish and Wildlife person here, Paula Call, who has been quite good to our District.)

Local, State and Federal agencies should work together to focus their strengths toward the protection and use of the river and lands. The support and involvement of all groups working together seems to be the best plan.

New promises have been made, in President Clinton's Proclamation, to protect all existing rights as acknowledged in previous documents/agreements. How will this be interpreted?

In closing, the District is honored to host a meeting where the principals of democracy can be exercised. I will tell you candidly that there is a feeling that you (the Committee) may represent a "wolf in sheep's clothing." If this is the case, it would dishonor our government and your host. The support and involvement of all groups working together seems like the better plan for the people, the Reach, the Country.

Jim Curdy

Mr. Curdy distributed maps to the Committee and public present.

Mr. Curdy spoke of his continued interest in turning the lands that are the National Monument over to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation for irrigated farmland. He stated that these lands were taken from the farmers by the Atomic Energy Commission (later the Department of Energy) until they were done using them. Now their uses have been completed and they should be turned back to the farmers. Land east of Mattawa, was in the BOR and the land was loaned to the AEC/DOE for a protective zone. When the land was no longer needed, it should have been returned (and documents demonstrate so) as initially planned. It should go to Columbia Basin Project. On the dams up north, President Eisenhower began negotiations. President Kennedy has signed it, as well as President Johnson. Additionally it was signed by the Canadian Parliament and three U.S. Congresses. It exists. All information and documentation is available in Ellensburg; every treaty and agreement that the U.S. entered into.

Mr. Curdy stated his concern for the rights of the transmission lines and utilities to continue their operations in the area and that he had fought to secure those valid existing rights. He indicated that his interest in the issues is financial. He stated that if certain rights aren't protected then water users and all the people in the area will have to pay. It is very clear in the Monument that these lands that were preplanned cannot be included in the Monument. All lands north of the Columbia River are BOR and should be turned over to Columbia Basin project for irrigated agriculture.

Mr. Curdy clarified that he is a citizen, but represents the interests of Adams, Benton and Grant Counties.

He stated that the Columbia is a Navigable River, and therefore anyone can come up or down the river and no one can stop them.

Ms. Shorett asked if there were any other comments to be made. There were none and the Committee broke for lunch.

Reed Waite, Washington Water Trails:

Whenever waterfront is being developed we want to be involved as small boats would be involved. I hope that you keep an open mind on camping and open boating on the Monument.

Liz Leitz:

My main concerns are as Liz Leitz, a citizen of Mattawa. There is some confusion as to what your main goal is. Your decisions will not be law, but advice. A couple of comments, in the declaration from President Clinton there is the sharing of the land. I am just talking about the river corridor. Pristine means unspoiled. The last free flowing stretch of the Columbia. I would like you to look at the plans that have been developed over the last ten years. I have a stack of EIS's and they just sitting there doing nothing. Look deep and ask a lot of questions. I hope that your information is not set aside.

I hope that you are not here on your employer's time, because many of you work for the government and government contractors and have an interest in the outcome. When you look at management plans, look at the river corridor. Many acres in our area are not subsidized. Lack of publicity of this meeting is disturbing to me. The town of Mattawa does not know that you are here or more of the townspeople would be here. I have two documents supporting PILT payments. If these payments are not made, there are many things we cannot provide our citizens, such as educational and fire fighting services. This is a very important payment. We cannot have our land taken away with no compensation. Regarding the transfer of management rights, DOE has told our people that 640 acres is their land. If DOE does not need this land and is going to transfer it to FWS, consider that we need that land.

Following Ms. Leitz's comments the Committee discussed publicity regarding their meetings and requested that more notice be given to local and regional papers. Additionally, anyone on the sign-in list would be directly notified of the meeting. The Committee voiced their commitment to the public that their meetings will be widely published in the future.

Richard Leitz

We raise a family and farm here. We use to have flashing lights at the end of our town that would warn us of hazards due to Hanford. I would like to thank Paula Call, Jeff Haas and Keith Klein. They have all come out and talked to us and have listened to what we had to say. There are parameters that you are working around. You need to look at the CLUP and read what it says. Chris Jensen said that he represents the City of Richland and employed by Fluor. I feel that I have no representation on this committee. There is too much money involved in this. 70 percent of the land is owned by the State. We receive no benefits from this. There are no tourism benefits. The only way we can benefit is to have DOE employees live here in our town. What is the real value of the land? The property is priceless. We have vineyards out here that are priceless. The ground is classified as world class. Consider the loss of money to this community.

**Next Agenda Topics and Closing Remarks**

Topics to be covered at future Committee meetings are valid existing rights, land transfer, transmission lines, irrigation projects, water rights and others identified in the Proclamation.



Committee members asked for an interpretation of the organic laws and whether certain rights are grandfathered. Committee members also asked that a large map be brought to the next meeting for easier discussion.

The Committee asked what the budget situation for the Committee is. Mr. Hughes replied that it looks as if the Monument is going to have an increase for FY 2002.

Rich Steele asked for information regarding what access or restrictions to access for recreation will be in place in the interim, before the CCP is complete. The Committee requested a list of changes that have been implemented on the Monument grounds since the designation and any more that might be coming up, including heightened security. FWS agreed that they could provide that information to the Committee.

Members and the Chair indicated that the agendas have been very ambitious and that the Committee needs more time to discuss each issue. It was recommended that agendas could be expanded over several meetings. The Committee will continue "feeling out" their role over the next couple of meetings.

The Committee will be meeting on October 25, 2001 in the Board Room in Administration Building of Columbia Basin College, in Pasco, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm.

Certified by,

---

Greg Hughes, Designated Federal Official

---

Jim Watts, Committee Chair

<b>Committee Seat</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Alternate</b>
K- 12 Education:	Karen Wieda	
Cities	Chris Jensen	
Conservation/Environmental	Rich Leaumont	Mike Lilga
Counties	Leo Bowman	Frank Brock
Economic Development	Jim Watts	Harold Heacock
Outdoor Recreation	Rich Steele	
Public -at-Large	Kris Watkins	
Scientific/Academic	Michele Gerber	
	Gene Schreckhise	Ed Rykiel
	David Geist	
State	Jeff Tayer	
Tribal	Robert Tomanawash	
Utilities/Irrigation	Doug Ancona	Nancy Craig
Designated Federal Officer	Greg Hughes	

**Participants and Invited Speakers**

Wahluke School District	Dr. William Miller, Superintendent
U.S. Department of Energy	Bob Rosselli, Deputy Manager for Business Services
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Paula Call, Outdoor Recreation Planner
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Mike Marxen, Pacific Northwest Planning Team Leader
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Steve Moore, Chief, Division of Refuges Operations Support

**Facilitators**

Triangle Associates, Inc.	Alice Shorett	Melanie Emerson
---------------------------	---------------	-----------------

**Meeting Support**

U.S. Department of Energy	Peggy Terlson
---------------------------	---------------

**Observers**

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Don Voros	Glenn Frederick
U.S. Department of Energy	Dana Ward	Diane Jordan
Congressman Hastings Office	Joyce Olson	
Public	Jim Curdy	
	Bill Erickson	
	Adam Fyall	
	Liz Leitz	
	Richard Leitz	
	Reed Waite	

## **DISTRIBUTED MATERIALS**

### **Committee's Packet of Materials**

Meeting Agenda (September 19, 2001)  
Revised Committee Groundrules (June 20, 2001)  
Vernita Bar Agreement (April 16, 1984)  
President Clinton's Memorandum to the Secretary of Energy (June 9, 2000)  
Written/Submitted Public Comments

### **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**

Comprehensive Conservation Plan Hanford Reach National Monument (slide presentation)  
Citizen's Wildlife Refuge Planning Handbook (Defenders of Wildlife, 1999)  
Final CCP and EIS: Little Pend Oreille (CD, April, 2000)  
Comprehensive Conservation Planning (fact sheet flyer)  
*Federal Register Notice*: National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act as Amended by the  
National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, Refuge Planning Policy; Notice  
(May 25, 2000)  
National Wildlife Refuge System: Selected Laws (October 5, 2001: Steve Moore)  
National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (flyer)  
Steve's 3<sup>rd</sup> handout?  
Draft Planning Map, Hanford Reach National Monument (October 1, 2001)

### **Public**

Hanford Area Site Plan (July 28, 1992) (Distributed by Jim Curdy)